

#8  
Dmt  
3-2803

**PATENT**  
Attorney Docket No. 210445  
Client Reference No. PA 28701 US-031

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re Application of:

Karl RANSBERGER et al.

Application No. 09/807,361

Art Unit: 1651

Examiner: Jon P. Weber

Filed: July 16, 2001

For: Influencing Hyperactive T Cells by  
Proteolytic Enzymes

**RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT**

Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, D.C. 20231

Dear Sir:

In response to the requirement for restriction dated September 26, 2002, please consider the following remarks.

**REMARKS**

The Office has set forth the following requirement for restriction:

group (i): claims 9-18, drawn to a treatment of hyperactive T-cells with protease and rutoside,

group (ii): claims 19, 20, 23 and 24, drawn to a treatment of hyperactive T-cells with protease and  $\alpha_2$ -macroglobulin, and

group (iii): claims 21, 22 and 25-28, drawn to a treatment of hyperactive T-cells with protease, rutoside and  $\alpha_2$ -macroglobulin.

Applicants elect the claims of group (i) for further prosecution. This election is with traverse for the following reasons.

The Office contends that groups (i)-(iii) do not relate to a single general inventive concept because they allegedly lack the same or corresponding special technical features. In support of its contention, the Office states that each method is drawn to the administration of a different combination of active ingredients. The Office further states that the combination of protease and rutoside has a separate utility from the combination involving the

03/28/2003 DTHOMAS 000001 121216 09807361

01 FC:1255

1073 00 CH